MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., SEPTEMBER 7,1922.

The second meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1923 was held in its office at 1729 New York Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D. C., Thursday, September 7, 1922.

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Greenleaf,
Mr. Fraser,
Mr. Bacon,
Mr. Ayres,
Mr. Mowbray,

also Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Acting Secretary and Executive Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The minutes of the meeting held July 20, 1922, were approved.

2. APPOINTMENT OF THE ACTING SECRETARY AS SECRETARY: Upon the recommendation of Colonel Sherrill, who had resigned as Secretary and Executive Officer of the Commission, stating that because of his many and varied duties as Officer in Charge of Public Buildings and Grounds, he desired to be relieved of official duties on the Commission of Fine Arts, and because it was thought these two governmental establishments should be kept separate, the former being an executive office and the latter advisory, the Commission adopted the following Resolution:

"RESOLVED, That Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Acting Secretary, be hereby appointed Secretary, Executive and Disbursing Officer of the Commission of Fine Arts, effective September 7, 1922.

The Treasury Department was advised accordingly. (Exhibit A.)

3. REPORT FOR THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE COMMISSION: The Commission approved the report prepared for the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission. (Exhibit B)

The Commission felt that the report was convincing in showing that

it would be very unwise and a great misfortune to the Plan of Washington to construct a bridge to Arlington on the extension of New York Avenue, instead of at the site near the Lincoln Memorial.

4. STATUE OF LINCOLN. Colonel Sherrill submitted to the Commission scale drawings prepared by Mr. Frank G. Pierson, architect, for the re-erection of the statue of Lincoln in front of the District Court House. The Commission approved the general scheme for erection of the statue as suggested in the designs, but recommended changes in the design of the pedestal; also that a scale model be submitted to the Commission (Exhibit C).

5. STATUE TO BASEBALL: The Commission took up the matter of a preliminary program of competition for the proposed statue to represent baseball. A tentative form was prepared, setting forth suggestions of the Commission, and the amounts indicated therein for prizes were agreed to. The Commission endorsed the recommendation of Mr. Bacon that the matter of drawing up a program of competition be referred, through Mr. Fraser, to the National Sculpture Society.

6. STATUE OF JUSTICE FOR THE PEACE PALACE AT THE HAGUE: Mr. Moore reported that Mr. Phillips, Acting Secretary of State, had informed him of their desire to take up the matter of a statue for the Peace Palace at the Hague, for which a preliminary design had been submitted by Andrew O'Connor, sculptor, in 1915; work on its completion was held in abeyance because of the World War.

Mr. Moore stated that he had written to Mr. O'Connor on the subject, and that Mr. O'Connor had replied by letter of August 30, 1922, as follows:

Paxton, Massachusetts,
August 30, 1922.

"Dear Mr. Moore:

I received your letter regarding the statue of Justice for the Hague and curiously enough I was about to write letting

you know the statue would be finished between the 15th and end of September.

It seemed better to let the matter stand still during the war, but for the past year I have given it almost all my time and I am now looking forward to the moment when I can show it to you.

Sincerely yours,
Andrew O'Connor."

The Commission suggested that Mr. O'Connor submit a photograph of the statue and that inquiry should be made of the State Department regarding arrangements for a trip of inspection to the studio of Mr.O'Connor. (Exhibit D).

7. STATUE OF SERENITY: Mr. Moore reported that Mr. Charles Deering, of Chicago, desires to present an ideal statue to Washington to be erected to Admiral Schuetze, and that the matter is coming before the Commission as to whether they favor the erection of an ideal figure rather than a portrait statue.

Mr. Fraser stated that he heartily approved the idea. Mr. Greenleaf said there is precedent in this respect in the erection of the Butt-Millet Fountain, the Dupont Fountain, and the McMillan Fountain, and that it is very important that the ideal figure in sculpture have the proper landscape-setting.

The Commission were agreeable to the offer of Mr. Deering, subject to the enactment of legislation by Congress, authorizing the erection of the proposed statue in Washington.

8. WAR MEMORIAL TABLET, AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT: A revised design for the War Memorial Tablet of the Agricultural Department, made by Mr. Flanagan, sculptor, was submitted to the Commission and approved. The Commission thought the design considerably better than the former design submitted. (Exhibit E).

9. MEDAL FOR THE BUREAU OF MINES: Mr. Moore reported that in August

Mr. Fraser forwarded sketch designs made by Mr. B. Nebel, sculptor, of Pittsburgh, for the proposed medal for the Bureau of Mines, and that the Bureau had approved the design representing Rescue Work, subject to certain changes, which had been brought to the attention of the sculptor, particularly as to the obverse.

Mr. Fraser stated that Mr. Nebel had made the changes suggested, and submitted photographs of the revised design, which were brought to the attention of the Commission.

The Commission felt that the reverse of the original design (showing a lantern), with changes in the lettering, would be much better than the revised design of the reverse, suggesting the designs be brought to the attention of the Bureau of Mines, with the recommendations of the Commission in this matter. Mr. Fraser stated that the reductions of the medal should not be made smaller than 2 3/4 inches in diameter.

10. MEADE MEMORIAL: Mr. Moore informed the Commission of the desire of Mr. Grafly for an inspection of the model of the Meade Memorial at his studio in Lanesville, Massachusetts, and that the question of payment of a trip of inspection (about $200) had been taken up with the Meade Memorial Commission. The Commission expressed their willingness to inspect the model as soon as the trip is authorized by the Meade Memorial Commission.

11. REAPPOINTMENT OF MR. MOORE: The Commission were informed that the term of office of Mr. Moore as a member of the Commission of Fine Arts, expired September 11, 1922 (or until his successor shall have been appointed and qualified), and that the question of his reappointment would soon come before the President.

The Commission (in the absence of Mr. Moore) considered his years of

service as one of the original members of the Commission, from the time of its creation in 1910, and commended his great service in behalf of the Commission and its work in the development of the Plan of Washington. The members therefore felt it very desirable and important that Mr. Moore continue to serve as a member of the Commission of Fine Arts and unanimously recommended his reappointment to the President. (Exhibit F.)

12. STATUE OF BURKE: Mr. Peaslee submitted informally inscriptions furnished by the Sulgrave Institution for the statue of Edmund Burke, to be erected in Washington. The Commission concurred in the proposed placing of them if space would permit. A minor change in the detail of the base was suggested by Mr. Bacon.

13. STATUE OF DANTE. Upon request of Colonel Sherrill, by letter of September 5, 1922, that if possible the Commission decide on a design for a permanent pedestal for the statue of Dante in Meridian Hill Park, without waiting for a revised landscape plan for the immediate locality, the Commission inspected a design made by Mr. H. W. Peaslee, architect, drawn according to ideas discussed with the Commission last spring, at which time the Commission recommended a simplification of the pedestal, and that a low pedestal be retained; that the base step of the pedestal be on the level of the transverse park walk, without any step leading up to it; and that the park setting be restudied,with an open space somewhat similar to the one at the opposite end of the park walk, and that the enclosing wall and balustrade should be developed.

With modifications, which were noted on the sketch submitted by Mr. Peaslee, the design of the pedestal was approved.

The Commission had as their guests at luncheon Mr. Henry Kendall, of

Boston, former President of the American Institute of Architects, and Mr. Louis Simon, Chief of the Supervising Architect's Office, Treasury Department. In the afternoon an inspection trip was made with Mr. F. G. Coldren, of the Washington Board of Trade, and Chairman of the Committee on Parks, inspecting several proposed park projects for the District of Columbia.

COPY

September 8, 1922.

Sir:

I have to inform you that at the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held in Washington, D. C., September 7, 1922, Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Acting Secretary, was appointed Secretary, Executive and Disbursing Officer of the Commission of Fine Arts, effective September 7, 1922. The following is a copy of the Resolution:

> "RESOLVED, That Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Acting Secretary, be hereby appointed Secretary, Executive and Disbursing Officer, of the Commission of Fine Arts, effective September 7, 1922."

Mr. Caemmerer being now under bond in the sum of $5,000, it is thought no additional bond will be necessary. His duties as Secretary will be the same which he has had as Acting Secretary since July 1, 1922.

I have to request, therefore, that the records of the Treasury Department be changed to conform to this action of the Commission.

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The Honorable

The Secretary of the Treasury.

EXHIBIT A.

D/1

COPY

September 7, 1922.

Dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the receipt of your letter of July 5, 1922, asking advice as to certain matters relating to the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River.

In your letter is the statement to the effect that the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission is considering the construction of a bridge on the line of New York Avenue extended instead of on a line drawn from the Lincoln Memorial to the Arlington Mansion.

This intimation has led the Commission to examine with greatest care into the reasons for a location at variance with the plan for the improvement of the Washington park system as reported to the Senate in 1902, which plan has been embodied in all legislation by Congress for the improvement of the area from the Capitol to and including the Lincoln Memorial grounds.

Two vital features of that plan are,--first, the continuation of the District Park System across the Potomac River to the newly reclaimed lands stretching from Analostan Island nearly to the Highway Bridge; and secondly, to unite two national memorials, the Arlington Cemetery and the Lincoln Memorial. The idea in the public mind, and also embodied in legislation, is to create a Memorial bridge. To change radically a plan

which has been before the public for more than twenty years; to substitute a traffic bridge for a memorial bridge, is so great an innovation as to call for cogent reasons.

It is true that the plan of 1901 is not binding on any official, or any commission. However, this plan has been carried out as to a majority of its elements. Therefore no change in an essential remaining element should be made except for reasons that will clearly commend themselves.

If the change were made to save expense, that reason would be entitled to careful consideration. The New York Avenue line, however, contemplates a high viaduct, 2578 feet in length, and including high level approaches from "end of estimate" to "end of estimate" would be 4,631 feet in length. The bridge structure at the Lincoln Memorial site would be about 2,000 feet in length, and both terminals would be a part of the park system.

The extension of New York Avenue would involve the destruction of one or two valuable buildings of the Naval Hospital, and would take off so much of the hospital grounds as to dismember that institution. Even then New York Avenue must be diverted from a straight line, in order to provide for a Virginia terminus on Government property.

THE NEW YORK AVENUE LINE CONSIDERED.

The arguments in favor of a bridge on the New York Avenue line, as stated to the Commission, are:

First, the bridge can be built without a draw, whereas the large amount of river traffic to the Georgetown wharves would necessitate a draw if the bridge were built on the Lincoln Memorial-Arlington line.

To this argument it may be answered that Chicago has built a

monumental bridge with a bascule draw where Michigan Avenue crosses the Chicago River. Both the street traffic and the river traffic in Chicago are now many times as great as they now are in Washington; and the increase is at far greater rate than it is here.

Moreover, the river traffic to Georgetown is carried on mainly in towed barges, which could readily pass beneath the arches of a memorial bridge. Practically all the merchandise for Georgetown is transported by railroad. The fact that a sailing vessel comes to Georgetown now and then is an exception. The record shows that out of a total of 606,762 tons of water-borne freight carried in 1921, 500,805 tons consisted of sand and gravel, carried in barges which could pass under the arches of a memorial bridge at the Lincoln Memorial site. One steamer, the oil tanker Paraguay (which made five trips to the plant of the Washington Gas Company) and five schooners (loaded with cordwood, grain, etc.) during the six months ending September 1921, made 14 passages, that would have necessitated the opening of a draw. This would require only one opening every seven days. Ninety-three passages were made by coal and oil barges which could pass under the bridge.

Second, It is argued that the bridge would connect with the Lee Highway.

The plan of the Lee Highway Association shows that proposed thoroughfare as crossing the Potomac River on the new Aqueduct or Key Bridge. A bridge on the New York Avenue line would have its Virginia terminal on the road running in front of the Arlington Cemetery. The memorial bridge at the Lincoln Memorial site reaches the same road, and one would connect with the Rosslyn terminal of the Lee Highway as well as the other. The Government

is about to open a new highway bridge from Georgetown to Rosslyn, and a second traffic bridge would seem to be unnecessary.

Third, that either the bridge must be subordinate to the Lincoln Memorial, or the Lincoln Memorial must be subordinate to the bridge; and of the two alternatives the subordination of the Memorial is to be chosen.

It is not easy to conceive that such a choice will find favor. Nor is it necessary to make such a choice. While it is true that the construction of a high bridge would dwarf and belittle the Lincoln Memorial, a bridge on the Arlington line would become an important element in a great composition. The bridge would be subordinate to the Lincoln Memorial only in the sense that the Union Station is subordinate to the Capitol, both being parts in one great scheme of Capital improvement, and each taking its appropriate place in that scheme.

Fourth, Congested traffic conditions would be created by having the bridge terminal near the Lincoln Memorial.

On the contrary, the Lincoln Memorial was located, and its surroundings were planned, so as to care for the traffic that would cross a memorial bridge. The great circle around the memorial was planned with the bridge in view; the circle, like the one around the Arch of Triumph in Paris, was designed as a point of reunion and departure for the roads leading from and to East Potomac Park and Rock Creek Parkways and to the Memorial Bridge.

B Street, now narrowed west of Eighteenth Street, should be continued with uniform width, with a parking space down its center similar to the parking space from Fifteenth to Eighteenth Streets. Then B Street can be used as an entrance to Potomac Park for practically its whole length; and where B Street reaches Twenty-third Street a sixty-foot roadway can be constructed from B Street to sweep around in the rear of the Memorial, to

the bridge. From the point where New York Avenue joins Twenty-third Street the latter street can be widened for the short distance to B Street. A plan embodying these suggestions is submitted herewith.

Fifth, that New York Avenue extended would open a passage way from Virginia to the White House and the business center of Washington.

In answer it may be observed that New York Avenue, while pointing towards the White House and the business center, does not lead to the business center or through it, but to Seventeenth Street. The change would bring additional traffic to the already congested corner of Seventeenth Street. On the other hand, if B Street were extended in its full width to Twenty-third Street and from this point swept around to a similar round-point south of the Memorial and outside of the circular drive, it would cause no congestion at the Memorial, and would serve a bridge at this point perfectly. B Street would be able to absorb traffic to or from a bridge much better than New York Avenue; being a double parked street, extending without interruption and with few cross streets, almost from the Capitol to the river. It is fed by practically every north and south street (except Sixteenth) throughout the length of the city proper.

Sixth, that it would aid the development of New York Avenue.

This development is certain to come in any event. The question is as to whether an increased development is worth the price of dismembering the Naval Hospital and the destruction of valuable buildings.

Seventh, A more imposing structure could be created on the New York Avenue line.

This would be true provided the bridge were to be made the only feature in the landscape. As a matter of fact the bridge is only one of

many elements in a large and comprehensive plan. As such it should take its place. Otherwise, however imposing it may be in itself, it will be so unrelated to other structures near it as to become an example of bad taste.

A MEMORIAL RATHER THAN A TRAFFIC BRIDGE.

Having now considered the arguments put forth in support of a bridge on the New York Avenue line, we next consider the reasons for adhering to the Arlington line in preference to the New York Avenue line. The importance of following the plan of 1901 is set forth by Mr. Frederick Law Olmsted:

> "As one of the original members of the Commission of Fine Arts and as the sole surviving member of the Commission of 1901, which drafted the restoration and extension of the L'Enfant plan for the central features of the park system of the District of Columbia, I want to express to you my deep concern in regard to the current proposition to construct the Memorial Bridge across the Potomac River in a location directly conflicting with the conclusions upon which the Commission of 1901 based its general plan and in accordance with which the Lincoln Memorial was placed, designed and erected.
>
> These conclusions and the essential reasons for them were set forth in the report of that Commission. I will not, therefore, attempt to restate them here in extenso.
>
> I will only say that the very location which is now proposed for the Memorial Bridge had been proposed prior to 1901, was given the most careful and open-minded consideration by the members of the Commission, and was rejected in favor of the location shown upon our plans, namely on the direct line drawn from the Lincoln Memorial at the end of Mall to the Lee Mansion in Arlington, in accordance not merely with the vote of the Commission but in accordance with the individual judgment of every member. And the coincident deliberate judgment in such a matter of Charles F. McKim, Daniel Burnham, Augustus St. Gaudens and the undersigned ought not lightly or hastily to be brushed aside by any new Commission or Committee of Congress.
>
> I am an open-minded man by nature; I hold no belief in the infallibility of experts; I am always ready to reopen a question of grave importance for the fullest reconsideration. Up to the present time I have heard no arguments for the New York Avenue site which were not fully considered by us in reaching our conclusions of 1901; but there may be such.

Let the matter again be fully considered in the light of all the facts that can be brought to bear upon it. But in the name of all that is sane and well and economical in the management of public affairs, after the Lincoln Memorial has just been completed and dedicated, in pursuance of a great and carefully contrived general plan, let us not lightly upset that plan in one of its most conspicuous features, intimately related for ill to the Lincoln Memorial."

A MENACE TO THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL.

That a bridge on the New York Avenue line would menace the Lincoln Memorial is the deliberate judgment of Mr. Henry Bacon, the architect of that structure, who writes:

> "I am sending three blueprints of a drawing showing the relative size of the three central arches of the proposed New York Avenue Bridge and the Lincoln Memorial. The drawing of the three arches of the bridge was made in accordance with measurements of the bridge as shown on the drawing made in the United States Engineer's Office. This drawing shows the two structures, not only giving the relative sizes, but also their relation to the mean low water level. The stylobate of the Lincoln Memorial is 61 feet above mean low water level and the top of the roadway of the bridge is 100 feet above the mean low water level.
>
> The Washington end of the proposed New York Avenue Bridge is about 1300 feet distant from the Lincoln Memorial. The center of the largest span of the bridge is about 2,000 feet from the Lincoln Memorial.
>
> The huge scale of the bridge is very evident in this drawing and it conclusively shows that it will dominate the Lincoln Memorial and dwarf its scale."

A MEMORIAL BRIDGE PART OF THE PARK SYSTEM.

A cogent argument against a high level bridge on the New York Avenue line is made by Mr. James L. Greenleaf, the landscape architect member of the Commission of Fine Arts, who emphasizes the fact that--

> "Such a bridge would require the passage of Rock Creek Parkway under it, with no relation to it. Traffic from the Potomac Parkway would have no connection with the bridge except by a side pass back into the city. Instead of this misfit all drives including a sweeping curve from B Street, should be brought into a plaza on the axis

of the Lincoln Memorial. There the Memorial Bridge head, the Rock Creek Parkway and the Potomac Water terrace, will give a noble opportunity for tremendous distinction.

In this connection the parking on the Virginia side of the Potomac is to be considered, where, on the newly made Columbia Island, will be a parkway similar to that in Potomac Park. Some day Arlington Cemetery will extend to the channel between Columbia Island and the mainland. The terminus of the Memorial Bridge on Columbia Island would be a circle from which the east, west, and south roads would diverge, and this circle itself would afford opportunity for a fine memorial."

## SUMMARY

The general plan of Potomac Park laid out by the Park Commission twenty years ago provided for an orderly extension of the L'Enfant plan made over a century ago. The eminence attained in design by the authors of the Park Commission plan warrants the conclusion that their decisions regarding the plan of Potomac Park and its environs were right in principle.

Before the Park Commission was appointed, designs for a bridge to Arlington on the line of New York Avenue had been made. The Park Commission considered this project and decided finally that a better plan was to have the bridge start from the site of the Lincoln Memorial; and all the drawings made under their direction show this important feature of the composition in this position.

A low bridge, 80 feet in width, starting from this point unites Potomac Park with Arlington, and from the same starting point the Park Commission planned a boulevard uniting Potomac Park with Rock Creek Park.

These monumental highways symmetrically converging at the Lincoln Memorial give to the Memorial a greater significance, and the view of the Lincoln Memorial approached from Arlington by the proposed bridge centering on it will be especially fine.

The approaches from Potomac Park to the bridge can be so planned that vehicles need not come within 500 feet of the Memorial in order to cross the bridge. Seen from the Memorial this bridge will have the appearance of a broad highway on the axis of the Arlington Mansion, and it will be balanced by the first part of the boulevard mentioned above, leading from the Memorial to Rock Creek Park.

A high masonry bridge starting from the Naval Hospital grounds on the axis of New York Avenue would have no direct connection with, and no architectural relation at all, to Potomac Park. By reason of its great height (one hundred feet) and the large scale of its arches, it would diminish the scale of the Lincoln Memorial; and the bridge, by reason of its oblique direction, would appear to be closing in on the Memorial. Also it would cut off the view of the Memorial from Georgetown and from the Key Bridge.

Very few masted vessels use the upper portion of the Potomac River, and if docking facilities for such vessels shall be provided (as planned by the District Commissioners) on the Anacostia River, railroad and other traffic across the Potomac need never be interrupted by bridges. In case, however, masted vessels must go up the Potomac, it would be more truly monumental planning to have a low bridge with a draw centering on the Lincoln Memorial, as planned by the Park Commission, rather than have the bridge along the extension of New York Avenue, where it would have no relation to Potomac Park.

The bridge in any case should be very simple in design to accord with the Doric order of the Lincoln Memorial, and the bridge should be no more elaborate in one location than in the other. The plan of 1901 calls for a much shorter masonry structure on the Virginia side than is estimated in the Engineer's report even for a low bridge on the New York Avenue site. The

bridge on the Lincoln Memorial-Arlington site, by reason of the fact that it involves the least masonry, is the least expensive.

The main axis of the Mall links together the Capitol, the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial; and it was the wise plan of the great designers of the scheme to carry, by means of a Memorial Bridge, this axis on to Arlington. Thus without interruption the beholders of those monuments would have impressed on their minds the vista which binds them together and which, adding to the importance of each, makes one grand sweep from the Capitol to the Mansion on the heights of Arlington. It will be, when completed, one of the greatest compositions in architectural design in the world. Its value would be most seriously lessened if the bridge, planned to connect the Lincoln Memorial with Arlington, is placed elsewhere.

The New York Avenue bridge, 100 feet high, would cost a great deal more than the other, but economical considerations aside, a Memorial Bridge from the Lincoln Memorial to Arlington, forming an integral part of the big plan of Washington, is so essential to the design already carried to the brink of the Potomac that it should be absolutely the choice of the authorities. The basic continuity of the plan of Major L'Enfant should be preserved.

The Commission of Fine Arts respectfully advise that a memorial bridge of masonry, sixty feet of roadway and two side walks each ten feet wide, be constructed on a line drawn from the Lincoln Memorial to the mansion house at Arlington.

Attached hereto are the individual reports from the members of the Commission of Fine Arts, together with plan and blueprint.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Colonel C. O. Sherrill,
Executive and Disbursing Officer,
Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT B.

COPY

September 8, 1922.

Dear Colonel Sherrill:

Your letter of September 6, transmitting four brown-prints showing a proposed plan for the re-erection of the statue of Lincoln in front of the District Court House, was brought before the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting yesterday.

The general scheme for re-erection of the statue, as suggested in these designs, was approved. The Commission thought a pedestal according to the design would be somewhat too large, too wide and too deep, and recommended that the architect set up two compo boards to determine the proper proportion of the pedestal in relation to the statue and the building. The Commission requested that the architect submit a scale model of the statue and pedestal, of the size indicated in the design (3/4 inch to the foot).

Sincerely yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Colonel C. O. Sherrill,

Officer in Charge,

Office of Public Buildings and Grounds.

EXHIBIT C.

COPY

September 8, 1922.

Dear Mr. O'Connor:

Your letter of August 30 was a great surprise. It was read to the Commission of Fine Arts yesterday and Mr. Fraser told of his conversation with you over the telephone. What you said to him impressed him very much and gave reassurance to the members of the Commission. Mr. Fraser with some members of the Commission will probably visit you before very long, but pending the visit we would like to have as soon as possible a photograph of your work so far as it has progressed.

Cordially, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Andrew O'Connor, Esq.,

Paxton, Massachusetts.

EXHIBIT D.

COPY



September 8, 1922.

Dear Mr. Flanagan:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting yesterday approved your revised design for the Agricultural Department War Memorial Tablet. The Commission thought that you would probably get a mighty good thing out of it. Will you please be careful in making your arrangements with the War Memorial Committee of the Agricultural Department clear and distinct? If the memorial were to be placed out of doors the consent of the Joint Committee on the Library would be necessary and I think it would be better to obtain it in any case. After you have completed your arrangements with the Agricultural Department committee we will take up the matter with the Joint Committee on the Library. Attached is a copy of the Act. The photograph will be retained.

Sincerely, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. John Flanagan,

1931 Broadway,

New York City.

EXHIBIT E.

COPY

September 7, 1922.

Sir:

These members of the Commission of Fine Arts (being all the present members, except the Chairman), respectfully recommend that Charles Moore be reappointed a member of the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Moore has devoted more time to the plan of Washington than any other member of the Commission. His great knowledge of the work of the Commission renders him invaluable in the conduct of its affairs and the man best fitted to serve as Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts.

Very respectfully, yours,

J. E. Fraser,
Henry Bacon,
James L. Greenleaf,
H. Siddons Mowbray,
Louis Ayres.

The President,

The White House.

EXHIBIT F.